The Makkan Siege: In Defense of Juhaymān



Written by Sayyid

Table of Contents:

1. Background of Juhaymān and the Makkan Siege



Imām Juhaymān ibn Muhammad ibn Sayf Al-'Utaybī رحمه الله

Brother Abū Khubayb Al Muwa'hhid حفظه الله posted this[1]:

> Inshaa'Allaah, I will post some information which I will gather from the internet, books, and various other sources regarding this courageous hero.
>
> But for now, I will just post some things which are available in the internet/books already.
>
> It should be remembered, everything I post here, is from the internet/books (unless stated otherwise)- and if it is from the kuffaar, its validity is in doubt.

Here is the first article:

> **Grand Mosque siege inspires Al Qaida militants 25 years later**

[1] This section gives an overall view as to who Juhaymān was and what he did. It is a series of articles on the Makkan Siege. Some of these articles are not completely posted here since we chose to only put the relevant parts that were pertaining to Juhaymān.

Published: 3/12/2004, 08:34 (UAE)

Reuters

Riyadh: Just after dawn prayers hundreds of militants led by the wild-looking, long-haired Juhayman Al Oteibi took over the Grand Mosque in Makkah on a November morning in 1979, seizing control of the holiest site and demanding the overthrow Saudi Arabia's monarchy.

The repercussions of the two-week rebellion, which ended 25 years ago this month, are still felt in Saudi Arabia where a new generation of Al Qaida-linked militants is challenging the House of Saud.

Juhayman declared the pro-Western Saudi rulers corrupt, called for the banning of "evils" such as radio, television and the employment of women, and announced that a new messiah had come.

The rebellion was put down following heavy fighting in which 117 Juhayman supporters and a similar number of troops died.

Juhayman was captured and publicly beheaded within a month, along with 62 captured fighters.

A quarter of a century later, his doomed revolution still inspires radicals. "Juhayman is considered a kind of hero for Al Qaida and other mujahideen," said novelist and reform activist Turki Al Hamad.

Lawyer Mohsen Awajy said Al Qaida was using the same language as Juhayman to rally support against a royal family it portrays as a corrupt agent of the West. "Juhayman took over the mosque saying the government was infidel - Al Qaida are saying the same," he said.

Saud Homoud Al Oteibi, believed to be the latest Al Qaida leader operating in Saudi Arabia, modelled himself on Juhayman in his youth, according to a Saudi with links to the militants.

"Saud grew his hair long just like Juhayman, dressed like him and adopted the same nom-de-guerre (Abu Mohammad)," he said. Al Qaida literature on the Internet is filled with references to the leader of the Makkah rebellion.

"Juhayman was a turning point in the history of Saudi Arabia," Al Hamad said. "It is true the government defeated him and his gang but they could not abolish his deep-rooted thought.

"Society started to adopt these ideas in the name of revival. Before him Saudi Arabia was more open, tolerant. After him society began heading towards fundamentalism."

The powerful religious authorities kept a firm control over the judiciary and schools. They also policed cities to ensure strict compliance with demands that shops stayed shut at prayer times and women dressed modestly and did not mix with men.

Just as it rode out the Juhayman revolt, Saudi Arabia says it has now defeated the militants, whose last big attack took place six months ago in the Gulf city of Al Khobar.

Critics say the crackdown has tackled the symptoms, not the disease which they believe afflicts their country.

"The problem is extremist thought and the hatred of others," said Mansour Nogaidan, a writer and former radical who has rejected the violence he once espoused.

"They have not struck at the root of it until now. They have even used the extremist thought as a defence against terrorism but it is the extremism which gave rise to the terrorism."

One difference stands out between today's Al Qaida and Juhayman 25 years ago Saudi Arabia could shut out the world and deal with its problems as it pleased.

With the eyes of the world focused on Riyadh since the September 11 attacks, this is no longer the case.

Under pressure from domestic reformers and from allies like the United States, the kingdom has introduced modest reforms including municipal elections - for men - and revisions of school texts.

The changes may be too little, too slow for many activists but Awajy said Saudi rulers know the world is watching them.

~~~~~

Brother Abū Khubayb said "The bold sentence below is a blatant lie from the kuffaar."

Here is the second article:

Militant Wahabism: From Juhayman to Osama & "Saddam Generation"
~~~~~

http://www.middleeasttransparent.com/old/texts/nabil_sharaf_eldin_copts_in_zurich.htm

It is the case of Juhayman al-Otaibi who occupied the Holy Mosque with a number of his followers in a famous incident that violently shook the Muslim world, thus inaugurating the Super-Wahabi, or the post-Wahabi, movements. These movements later became the intellectual (ideological) basis for the new fundamentalists represented by Bin Laden, the Emir of militant Wahabism.

Juhayman Bin Mohamed Bin Seif al-Otaibi was born in a Brotherhood settlement in the area of Quseim, close to the city of Ghatghat, the headquarters of Sultan Bin Bijad who was killed by the forces of the founding King Abdel-Aziz during the famous Sibla battle. Juhayman had a strict religious upbringing. He married the daughter of prince Sajer Al Mohaya who was arrested after the Harām incident, then later married the sister of Mohamed Ibn Abdullah al-Qahtani. He work for about two years on the national guard forces. Juhayman studied at the Islamic university in Medina and was the student of Sheikh Abdel-Aziz Bin Baz, former Mufti of Saudi Arabia. Juhayman returned to Qusaim in 1974 with a number of students and started promoting the establishment of a fundamentalist movement that he called "The Brothers' Movement" at the time (different from the Egyptian group the Muslim Brotherhood). Juhayman exceeded the teachings and methodology of his teacher Sheikh Bin Baz, expressing direct criticism of Ibn Soud. Juhayman said that Sheikh Bin Baz never objected to the Brothers' Movement teachings, but that he had blamed them for focusing on Saudi issue alone. Juhayman then stopped attending Sheikh Bin Baz's meetings and lectures. In his third message "The Brothers' Call" he said that they (he and his colleagues) had to educate themselves when they couldn't find "pure" Sharia education in the official Sharia school. They promoted their movement in tribal areas and grew in number. They then moved to the capital Riyadh in 1976 where Juhayman published his first message under the title "The Law of Loyalty and Obedience: Corrupt Government" in which he attacked jurisprudents. In this message he said "People should not obey, but fight, Muslim rulers who do not adhere to the teachings of Quran and tradition. These corrupt rulers use Sharia to serve their own personal objectives and deal with unbelievers". These ideas led to his arrest with 98 of his followers in the summer of 1978. However, they were not put on trial. Sheikh Bin Baz was asked to examine their ideas and discuss with them. After listening to them, Bin Baz refused to consider them traitors, thus the authorities had to release them after they spent six weeks in prison. They promised to stop preaching and attacking rulers. Contrary to Osama Bin Laden who has no significant writings, Juhayman wrote 14 fundamentalist messages that included his ideas, parts of which where published under the title "The

Seven Messages". The messages were banned in Saudi Arabia. According to these messages, Juhayman believed that Saudi religious education as was conducted at that time should be stopped. Many Wahabis said that Juhayman said that "he saw hundreds of the graduates of these schools became preachers, as if preaching was a government profession where employees look forward to receiving their monthly salaries." He believed that such schools only produce religious representatives of the government, but not real ulama (religious scholars) or sheikhs, as he believed these should be independent leaders who think and act in accordance with the interests of Islam and society rather than the authorities as was the case in Saudi Arabia.

In his first message Juhayman talked about the emergence of the awaited Mahdi. In 1979 he wrote that prophet Mohamed visited him in a vision, then God talked to him and ordered him to announce that he was the Mahdi, sent to purify the earth from corruption. Qahtani also claimed he had the same vision. Qahtani then married Juhayman's sister. To be fair, not all Juhayman's writings were of that type. In his 11 messages he expressed his position towards rulers of Muslim countries in general, and the Saud family in particular; he also addressed major Islamic jurisprudence issues, such as Jihad, in addition to his position towards emirs and obedience. In his message Juhayman wonders: "Can jihad be declared against atheist countries when we have exchanged ambassadors and experts? How can we promote Islam when we have Christians for professors? Can we contradict our professors? Can we call for raising the jihad flag while the Christian flag stands side by side with the monotheism flag? We shouldn't be deceived to that extent, as there should be a clear distinction between what is right and what is wrong. We should stay away from these people, we should fight them."

This is the same logic that Bin Laden used 20 years later in the speech broadcast by Al Jazira where he divided the world into two "areas": the area of Islam and the area of atheism. He described the issue as a "crusade" against Islam and Muslims. Thus he follows the same line as Juhayman, and finds justifications in the older literature of Ibn Taimiya, al-Mawdudi, Qutb, and others.

~~~~~

Here is the third article:

http://www.ceip.org/

One of the first indications of how deep internal dissent in Saudi Arabia has been, and how much it poses a problem for the stability of a government which has been surprisingly stable despite enormous
~~~~~

economic and social changes in the last 40 years, goes back to November 1979 when a group of Islamic fundamentalist extremists, headed by Juhayman al-'Utayba, captured the Grand Mosque in Mecca and held on to it for 14 days - something which has, I think, not been much mentioned in the press coverage of the recent weeks.

The day in November l979 on which the attack on the Mosque took place was the first of Muharram of the year 1400 according to the Hijra - the beginning of the 15th century in the Islamic calendar, obviously a very symbolic date. If you now look in retrospect at some of the manifestos brought out by Juhayman and his colleagues, they were attacking the Saudi dynasty for its alliance with the West, for its alliance with Christianity, for cooperation with the US, for introducing Western secularism and corruption to the Holy Lands of Islam - the same kind of things which we are hearing now from people associated with Osama bin Laden. After two weeks and hundreds of causalities, the Mosque was retaken, but it is a fact that about 20 years ago the holiest site of Islam was taken over by Islamic extreme terrorists, the Saudis were incapable of preventing it, and eventually had to rely on foreign troops (in this case the French Foreign Legion), to overcome the insurrection.

Now if you look at the people who were involved in it, most of them were coming from Najd, a very specific area in Saudi Arabia. The leaders, coming from the 'Utayba tribe, have been, in the 1930s, the opponents of the Saudi regime and Juhayman's father was killed in clashes with the Saudi dynasty - just as Osama bin Laden comes -and some of his supporters come - from another province, from Asir on the border with Yemen. Saudi Arabia is far from being a unified nation-state.

~~~~

Here is the fourth article:

THE MECCA SIEGE

Just when the rapid modernisation of tribal Saudi society led foreign observers to think that traditionalism was fading from the kingdom, a young man called Juhayman Ibn Muhammad Al Utaiby proved them spectacularly wrong.

On 20 November 1979, 500 dissidents led by the grandson of the leader of the Ikhwan rebellion – 38-year old Juhayman – seized Mecca's Grand Mosque. Almost fifty years to the day, Juhayman reiterated his ancestor's grievances as he grabbed the mosque's loudspeaker and announced that the House of Saud had lost its claim to legitimacy through corruption, ostentation, and mindless imitation of the West. His
~~~~

words were chilling to the royal family, all the more so because they closely resembled Khomeini's diatribes against the Shah.

The Saudi leadership was initially paralysed by the takeover. The Grand Mosque surrounds Islam's holiest shrine. Accordingly, no non-Muslim may enter the city of Mecca and shedding blood on such holy grounds is considered blasphemy. The Saudi royal family's hands were tied for days as they deliberated how to dislodge the dissidents. The Ulema had to issue a dispensation to allow the bearing of arms in a holy place before any military move could be authorized.

Once more, the traditional alliance of convenience between the religious establishment and the House of Saud served its purpose. The fatwa issued by the highest religious authority, Mufti Bin Baz, legitimised the unthinkable – spilling blood in Islam's holiest site. But even when the religious dilemma was solved, the Saudi military failed to end the siege. This time, the House of Saud had to ask the Ulema to sanction that the mosque be stormed by 'infidels'. This second fatwa set a precedent that was to be invoked again during the Gulf War.

RECAPTURING THE GRAND MOSQUE

Following two weeks of unsuccessful attempts to dislodge Juhayman, the king was forced to call for foreign help. It was clear that the Saudi Royal Guard was ill-equipped to face the situation. The French GIGN was chosen for the task. They went through a brief ceremony of conversion to Islam. The hastily-issued fatwa allowed French forces to enter the site armed, although they were able to force the rebels to surrender using only 'incapacitating gases'.

This incident, the details of which have been kept a state secret, inspired what was to become a movement of clandestine Islamic opposition within the Kingdom. Juhayman's public beheading only served to turn him into a martyr for many disgruntled youth. It is this same group of Islamic militants who lay the groundwork for organisations like that of Osama Bin Laden's Al-Qaida.

The timing of Grand Mosque's capture is crucial. 1979 was the year in which various events came together to sow the seeds of Moslem fundamentalism that pose a serious threat today.

If the Iranian revolution opened the way to Islamic movements, Egyptian President Sadat's separate peace treaty with Israel sent critics and dissidents flocking to the embrace of political Islam. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan provided the sanctuary in which these Moslemdissidents would receive military training and religious indoctrination.

If the GIGN came to the Saudis' rescue, it was a measure of the western world's interest in the Kingdom's stability and oil. But the Saudi-U.S. friendship was a solid anchor on which the Saudis could count upon for their security.

The events of the Grand Mosque worried America almost as much as the House of Saud. For the U.S., the fall of Iran was a disaster which they could not allow to be repeated in Saudi Arabia. If the price of keeping the House of Saud in power was to provide the country with the kind of sophisticated weapons that had been withheld until then out of concern for Israel's security, then so be it.

~~~~

http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/meria/meria797_kostiner.html

Faysal's order was sustained for many decades, mainly by satisfying most of Saudi society. Consequently, the opposition movement of November 1979 was an exception to the relative calm and did not portend further challenges. In that instance, several hundred activists, mostly from the former Ikhwan tribe 'Utayba, formed their group amilitary service with the National Guard. While some of them were students at the Islamic University of Medina, they were motivated in several ways, as their leader, Juhayman al-'Utaybi, demonstrated in his published letters which explained their anti-establishment religious convictions.

'Utaybi's group violently took over the Grand Mosque in Mecca, the holiest of all Islamic sites, on 20 November 1979. It drew support only from the manual workers and students of tribal origin, of the lower classes and foreign laborers (from Egypt, Yemen and Pakistan). The vast majority of Saudi society regarded them as a marginal group whose elimination by security forces was fully justified. A fatwa of 30 leading 'Ulama, dated 24 November, depicting them as rebels and troublemakers, added to the negative image. 7 In addition, 'Utaybi's demand that oil should not be sold to the United States and that state wealth should not be squandered but used only to meet society's needs, 8 had little appeal against a regime using considerable funds to raise its subjects' living standards.

'Utaybi's group was reacting, in an extreme fashion, to the sudden affluence and Western lifestyle which had begun to emerge in the Kingdom. He attempted to delegitimize Saudi rule in the tradition of the Ikhwan: Ibn Sa'ud deceived the Ikhwan by failing to lead them in a Jihad against neighboring states, instead forming an alliance with the "Christians". A good Muslim's duty, contended 'Utaybi, was to fight the West and reject the socio-technological "progress" of Saudi society.
~~~~

Further, he argued, the authority of the main 'Ulama was false. They were aligned with the Saudi family in a bond of corruption. 9 Like the Ikhwan, Juhayman's movement rejected the state's Islamic authority and monopoly of interpreting Wahhabi Islam with a call to overthrow the Saudi family, and combat the West and the senior 'Ulama. However, in 1979, there were no obvious and widely agreed reasons in Saudi society to do so. Most Saudis were basically satisfied with Faysal's order.

~~~~~

Here is the fifth article:

Islamist Opposition

Some elements of the Saudi population, the religious conservatives, have become militant in their anger with the regime. Part of the inspiration for their movement goes back to the foundation of the modern state in the early years of this century. Just before the First World War there arose in the plains north-east of Riyadh an agressive reformist body known as the Ikhwan, the Brotherhood, which in the next 15 years fought for the Emir (later King) Abdel-Aziz in the campaigns which won for the Saud family most of the Arabian peninsula. There was always some question as to whether Abdel-Aziz was using the Ikhwan or the Ikhwan using him, to promote its puritan views, and when the King wanted to call a halt to his campaigns after the conquest of the towns of the Hijaz in 1925-6 the two parties come into conflict.

The Ikhwan continued raiding into the territories which Britain had formed into Jordan and Iraq, and when Abdel-Aziz tried to curb them they rebelled. By this time they were fighting as much for the continuation of an unhampered tribal way of life as for their religious principles. They were defeated by loyal forces at the battle of Sibillah in 1929. What remained of the Brotherhood was later absorbed into the National Guard, and nothing has been heard of it as a formal organisation since. Among many of the tribes, though, and some of the Nejdi ulema there are people who are still attached to the militant puritanism of the Ikhwan and are shocked by what they see as the Godlessness of Riyadh, Jeddah and the other big cities. Such people formed the band of rebels with which Juhayman bin Mohammad Al-Otaibi seized the Grand Mosque of Mecca in November 1979.

~~~~

Here is the sixth article:

http://www.ahram.org.eg/

Three Al-Jihad members excelled at forgery. The first of these was Muhammad Amir Sulayman Saqr, who belonged originally to Jama'at Al-Muslimin, went to Saudi Arabia, and there took part in the take-over of the Meccan sanctuary led by the Saudi Juhayman Al-Utaybi. Sentenced to prison for nine years, he went to Peshawar on his release and there met Ayman Al-Zawahiri, who entrusted him with a number of tasks, among them the preparation of forged travel documents to be used to bring organization members to Afghanistan.

~~~~~

Here is the seventh article:

http://www.country-studies.com/

Some foreign observers thought in 1979 that traditionalism was no longer a strong force in Saudi Arabia. This idea was disproved when at least 500 dissidents invaded and seized the Grand Mosque in Mecca on November 20, 1979. The leader of the dissidents, Juhaiman ibn Muhammad ibn Saif al Utaiba, a Sunni, was from one of the foremost families of Najd. His grandfather had ridden with Abd al Aziz in the early decades of the century, and other family members were among the foremost of the Ikhwan. Juhaiman said that his justification was that the Al Saud had lost its legitimacy through corruption, ostentation, and mindless imitation of the West–virtually an echo of his grandfather's charge in 1921 against Abd al Aziz. Juhaiman's accusations against the Saudi monarchy closely resembled Ayatollah Ruhollah Musaui, Khomeini's diatribes against the shah.

The Saudi leadership was stunned and initially paralyzed by the takeover. The Grand Mosque surrounds the Kaaba, symbol of the oneness of God and believed by Muslims to have been built by the Prophet Abraham. The courtyard is one of the sites where the hajj, the fifth pillar of Islam, is enacted. Because of the holiness of the place, no non-Muslims may enter the city of Mecca. Furthermore, all holy places come under a special injunction in Islam. It is forbidden to shed blood there or to deface or to pollute them in any way. Despite careful planning on Juhaiman's part, a guard was shot dead by one of the nervous dissidents. Such a desecration is a major violation under Islamic law and merits crucifixion for the convicted offender.

Juhaiman's party included women as well as men, other peninsular Arabs, and a few Egyptians. A score of the dissidents were unemployed graduates of the kingdom's seminary in Medina. They had provisions for the siege they expected as well as extensive supplies of arms.
~~~~~

The government's initial attempts to rout the dissidents were stymied. Before any military move could be authorized, the ulama had to issue a dispensation to allow the bearing of arms in a holy place. When the religious problems were solved by announcement of the ulama's ruling, logistical problems bogged down the efforts of the military and the national guard for several days. Finally, two weeks later the military effort succeeded, and the dissidents were dislodged. All the surviving males were eventually beheaded in the squares of four Saudi cities.

Far from discounting the efforts of the rebels, the leaders examined themselves and their policies more closely. Khalid, particularly, was sensitive to their complaints. Many of the dissidents had come from two of the tribes that traditionally have been recruited for the national guard. Khalid had spent much time with these people in the desert.

~~~~

Abū Khubayb said "Raafidhee Taaghoot Khomeini claims Juhaymaan was a Zionist Agent."

Here is the eight article:

http://www.bible.ca/islam/library/

This was shown by the armed occupation of Mecca's Grand Mosque in November 1979 by a group of extremists led by Juhaiman al Utaibi.

A child of the Ikhwan who grew up in the shadow of its defeat, Juhaiman and his two hundred followers (who included Yemenis, Sudanese, Kuwaitis, Iraqis and Egyptians as well as Saudis) consciously imitated the style and behaviour of the original Ikhwan and called themselves by the same name. In a pamphlet published in Kuwait which was circulating inside Saudi Arabia at the time of the seizure of the Grand Mosque, Juhaiman denounced the royal family and explained that, according to Islamic law, the people are not obliged to obey impious rulers: 'They worship money and spend it on palaces, not mosques. If you accept what they say they will make you rich; otherwise they will persecute and even torture you.'4 During the occupation he broadcast similar attacks over the mosque's tannoy system, enabling the message to be heard all over central Mecca. He denounced the scandalous personal habits of the Saudi princes (drinking, gaming, visits to the fleshpots of the West), mentioning by name the Governor of Mecca, Prince Fawwaz ibn 'Abd al 'Aziz. After two weeks of fighting, allegedly under the direction of special forces flown in from France, the Saudi authorities gained control of the mosque and most of the surviving rebels were executed. The great majority of Muslims approved the verdict, agreeing that by
~~~~

bringing in arms the rebels had committed a sacrilege. Partly for this reason, no doubt, the Ayatollah Khomeini, Iran's revolutionary leader and a vitriolic critic of the Saudis, himself denounced the rebels, intimating that they must be US or Israeli agents. 'It is not beyond guessing', he announced on Tehran radio, 'that this is the work of criminal American imperialism and international Zionism.' For the zealots, a hint from Khomeini was a statement of incontrovertible fact: there were anti-American demonstrations in the Philippines, Thailand, Bangladesh, India, the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Turkey, Nigeria, Libya and even some western capitals. In Islamabad the military government of General Zia'ul Haqq astutely allowed rival student gangs of Muslim militants and supporters of his recently executed rival Mr Bhutto to unleash their feelings against the US embassy, which they burned to the ground.

~~~~

Here is the ninth article:

http://www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/

Resentment of abuse of state authority has long simmered just beneath the surface in Saudi Arabia, but the regime has historically been denounced only in private conversation, with criticism rarely erupting into public confrontation. But two important historic moments of opposition provide striking parallels with today's Islamist opposition movement: the 1929 Ikhwan rebellion and the 1979 seizure of the great mosque in Mecca by Juhaiman al-Utaibi. In both instances, the Islamic legitimacy of the al-Saud family was seriously challenged by movements that emanated from the heartland of traditional al-Saud support, the Najd. This meant that both movements were composed of muwahidun (unitarians, commonly called Wahhabis by detractors), who follow a particularly austere and puritanical belief system. Both times opposition was justified because the regime deviated from the straight path of the Koran and Sunna. Corruption was a common theme.

During the conquests of the peninsula in the early part of the twentieth century, the founder of Saudi Arabia, Abdulaziz, depended on the formidable fighting force of the Ikhwan, tribal muwahidun warriors, to extend the borders of his kingdom. When the strength on which he had depended turned against his leadership, Abdulaziz crushed the Ikhwan as a military force at the Battle of Sabalah in 1930. Nearly 50 years later, in 1979, Juhaiman al-Utaibi forcibly took control of the sacred mosque in Mecca in an effort to topple the ruling family. He was the grandson of an Ikhwan warrior; his charges against King Fahd of corruption, deviation, and dependence on the West echoed his grandfather's charges against
~~~~

Abdulaziz. Al-Utaibi did not garner much popular support because he chose a holy venue rather than a palace, but the incident exposed the vulnerability of the regime. It took several weeks and the assistance of French special units to root the rebels from the mosque. This uprising led to greater surveillance over the population, more power granted to the mutawwain (the Saudi "police" of public virtue), new constraints on mobility and expression, and simultaneous promises of reform.

———————————-

This concludes the articles section which provided some information about Imām Juheimān رحمه الله and I shall tell my conclusion of the matter Inshā'Allāh, very soon.

May Allāh reward Brother Abū Khubayb – may Allāh make his affairs easy for him - for this useful collection.

And all the Thanks and Praises belong to Allāh.

2. Tawhīd: In the words of Juhaymān

The Purpose of this section is to provide some translations of the works of Imām Juhaymān regarding Tawhīd; from just these translations, it is sufficient enough to prove that his 'Aqīdah was sound. To access his works in Arabic, please click here.

[Imām Al Mujaddid] Juhaymān bin Sayf Al-'Utaybī رحمه الله said in the Risālatul Imārah Wal Ba'yah Wa Tā'ah (treatise of leadership and pledge and obedience), page 29:

> "And the closest example and the clearest of it is the founder of their state [he meant this third state] King 'Abdul 'Azīz and the Shuyūkh who were with him in his sultanate. And they [Shuyūkh] were between those who agreed with him or a person who was silent upon his falsehood and those upon whom the matter was not clear, thus he called the Ikhwān رحمهم الله who migrated from different cities for Allāh عز و جل, he called him to give pledge upon the Book and the Sunnah. Thus they were fighting and conquering the lands and sending him – what was for the Imām – from the booty and khums (fifth of the booty) and Fei' [wealth found without any fighting or travelling] and its likes upon, (and) he was an Imām of the Muslims. Then when his kingdom was established and goal achieved, he then allied himself with the Christians. And he stopped the continuation of the Jihād in the path of Allāh outside of Jazīrah (Lands of Arab). Thus when they (Ikhwān) went out to fight the Mushrikīn of 'Irāq who calls 'Alī and Fātimah and Al-Hasan and Al-Hussein with Allāh (in Shirk), they named them – his ['Abdul 'Azīz] and the Shuyūkh of ignorance with him - with a name which the people of Islām hates and it is Khawārij; while the Ikhwān did not rebel against him and they did not obey him when he forbade them from Jihād, and after he named them khawārij, he incited those who did not go out with them (Ikhwān) to fight them. Thus he took them out and initiated fighting them, and when they met in the battlefield, each group attacked the other and each of them would boast and say "child of Tawhīd and I am the brother of who helped Allāh." Alas! What a bloody ending! And before that, he ['Abdul 'Azīz] sent a letter to As-Sharīf Hussein saying in it "Hussein O brother, you are in their neck and I am at their back", and when he killed them and dispersed them and when his tyrannical Sultanate became established, he allied the Christians and nullified the Jihād in the path of Allāh and evil opened from the closed doors. Then upon his methodology did his sons carry on after him until what reached the lands of Muslims from evil and corruption. Thus we say now: "Where is the ruling with the Book and Sunnah which they claim to have ruled with it from the beginning of their kingdom and which each claims whenever a pledged is renewed from them??.. And if you live long enough you will see that the son will

> become similar to the son and ignite war between the Muslims and make them wage war upon each other."

Regarding these words, the following has been taken from Al-Kawāshif Al-Jaliyyah Fī kufri Dawlah Sa'ūdiyyah by Shaykh Abū Muhammad Al Maqdesī حفظه الله:

> I say: O brothers of Tawhīd! When will you wake up from the misguidance you are in? As to attribute scholarship to Shuyūkh of Ignorance in our era who did not leave anything from what their examples did except they did it in a much worse way. The scholars of the Tāghūt in our era has clearly fought against the brothers of Tawhīd with what is much worse than the scholars of ignorance of that time! Until the Muftī of āl-Salūl has named the Mujāhidīn Al-Muwa'hiddīn as people who fight in the path of Tāghūt! So which kufr is greater than fighting in the path of Tāghūt and helping him with words and writing and with sermons and verdicts! These are those to whom you say "رحمه الله and حفظه الله" and those whom you promote in subconscious, and whose knowledge you ask to benefit from… Wallāhi, make disunity from these people and do not defend these kuffār who allied the tughāt against the Muwa'hhidīn. Allāh will not guide those who are unjust.

The following has been taken from Imam Juhaymān's book, "Raf' Al-Iltibās 'An Millati Man Ja'alahullāh Imāman Lin-Nās."

> All praise belongs to Allāh: **"The Forgiver of sin, the Acceptor of repentance, the Severe in punishment, the Bestower (of favours), none has the right to be worshipped but He, to Him is the final return. None disputes in the *Āyāt* (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) of Allāh but those who disbelieve. So let not their ability of going about here and there through the land (for their purposes) deceive you [O Muhammad, their ultimate end will be the Fire of Hell]! The people of Nūh and the confederates after them denied (their Messengers) before these, and every (disbelieving) nation plotted against their Messenger to seize him, and disputed by means of falsehood to refute therewith the truth. So I seized them (with punishment), and how (terrible) was My punishment!"**[2]
>
> And I testify that there is none worthy of being worshipped, except Allāh Alone, without any partner; and I testify that Muhammad is His Messenger and Slave – the one who said:

[2] *Ghāfir*: 3-5

"I have left you with two things after which you shall never go astray, as long as you adhere to them: the Book of Allah and my Sunnah. And they shall never part until they attend my Basin of Al-Kawthar."[3]

Ammā Ba'd:

Thus, we intended to clarify our *Manhaj* with regards to holding onto these two fundamentals which necessitates the one who holds onto them, that he will never be misguided; and to clarify our proof upon that from the two, and showing the deficiency of most of those who claim to hold steadfast to these two (fundamentals). And we will suffice by mentioning some of their groups, who appear to us to be amongst the closest of the groups who adhere to the Book and *Sunnah*; We ask Allāh to make them from amongst those who listen to the Word and follow the best thereof, and that their status (high position) amongst the people does not deter them (from sincerely following the Truth); and that they stand firm, as 'Abdullāh Ibn Salām stood firm, when he accepted the Truth which the Messenger of Allāh came with (salutations be upon him), even though he knew that his people would distort all his good deeds into evil deeds, and that he would loose all his status which he held amongst them. As was narrated by Al-Bukhārī mentioning the incident of his entering into *Islām*, until he had said:

O Messenger of Allāh! The Jews are a slanderous people- and indeed, if they know that I have become Muslim, then they will slander me."

So the Jews came, and the Prophet (peace be upon him) asked them, *"What type of a person is 'Abdullāh Ibn Salām amongst you?"*

They replied, "He is the best of us, and the son of the best of us! He is our noble, the son of our noble!"

He said, *"What would you think if he became Muslim?"*

So they replied, "May Allāh give him refuge from such a thing!"

So 'Abdullāh came out, and said, "I bear witness that there is none worthy of being worshipped, except Allāh; and I bear witness that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh."

So they said, "He is the wretched one, the son of the wretched one!" And they insulted him.

So he said, "O Messenger of Allāh! This is what I had feared."

And (we ask Allāh) to save them from the entrances of Shaytān, from which he enters upon some of the scholars and callers, and deceives them due to

[3] Narrated by Al-Hākim with an authentic chain.

the large number of followers. And indeed, we have seen them holding on to a part of *Islām* which is seventy-something branches; so sometimes, for example, he takes twenty branches only, and he adheres to them, and is harsh against those who contradict him in them- and from that, he gets some supporters, and some enemies; But in reality, he has lost the true fundamental (of *Lā Ilāha Illā Allāh*), and he deceives his own self, and deceives others, while he and others think that they have fulfilled *Islām*.

Yet, the Messenger of Allāh (salutations and peace be upon him) said,

"Indeed, none can fulfill the obligations of the Dīn of Allāh, except he who surrounds it from all sides."[4]

And the reason for which we have distanced ourselves from the *Jamā'āt* (groups), is because they think that disassociating from the *mushrikīn* and showing hostility to them, and speaking openly about the Truth, contains hardship and difficulty, and will prevent the spreading of the *Da'wah*, and will cause people to run away from it.

So there is amongst them those who are negligent regarding this fundamental, and there are those who have completely forsaken it; But we say that it is other than what they make it seem to be- Because Allāh has lifted hardship away from us, and has commanded us with this fundamental, and if there was hardship in it, then He would not have commanded us with it!

And listen to His (Most High)'s Statement:

وَجَاهِدُوا فِي اللَّهِ حَقَّ جِهَادِهِ هُوَ اجْتَبَاكُمْ وَمَا جَعَلَ عَلَيْكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ مِنْ حَرَجٍ مِلَّةَ أَبِيكُمْ إِبْرَاهِيمَ هُوَ سَمَّاكُمُ الْمُسْلِمِينَ مِنْ قَبْلُ وَفِي هَذَا لِيَكُونَ الرَّسُولُ شَهِيدًا عَلَيْكُمْ وَتَكُونُوا شُهَدَاءَ عَلَى النَّاسِ فَأَقِيمُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتُوا الزَّكَاةَ وَاعْتَصِمُوا بِاللَّهِ هُوَ مَوْلَاكُمْ فَنِعْمَ الْمَوْلَى وَنِعْمَ النَّصِيرُ

"And strive hard (i.e. wage *Jihād*) in the Path of Allāh as you ought to strive. He has chosen you, and has not laid upon you in religion any hardship, it is the religion of your father Ibrāhīm. It is He (Allah) Who has named you Muslims both before and in this (the *Qur'ān*), that the Messenger (Muhammad) may be a witness over you and you be witnesses over mankind! So perform *As-Salāt*, give *Az-Zakāt* and hold steadfast to Allāh. He is your *Mawlā* (Patron, Lord, etc.), what an Excellent *Mawlā* (Patron, Lord, etc.) and what an Excellent Helper!"[5]

So if Allāh has ordered us with *Jihād*, and has clarified that there is no hardship in it, and that that is the *Millah* of Ibrāhīm- then know that this

[4] Narrated by Al-Hākim, Abū Nu'aym, Al-Bayhaqī in "*Ad-Dalā'il*", and the incident in which this *Hadīth* is a part of, was declared "*Hasan*" by *Al-Hāfith* Ibn Hajar in "*Al-Fat'h*" (7/22). **Trans. Note:** Also see "*Kanz Al-'Ummāl*" (3/84).
[5] *Al-Hajj*: 78

fundamental – Waging *Jihād* With the Life, and Following the Religion of Ibrāhīm – it is this that differentiates the truthful one from the pretending claimant. And listen to what Allāh mentioned regarding the truthful ones:

إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ ثُمَّ لَمْ يَرْتَابُوا وَجَاهَدُوا بِأَمْوَالِهِمْ وَأَنْفُسِهِمْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الصَّادِقُونَ

"Only those are the believers who have believed in Allah and His Messenger, and afterward doubt not but strive with their wealth and their lives for the Cause of Allah. Those! They are the truthful."[6]

And said regarding the pretending claimants:

طَاعَةٌ وَقَوْلٌ مَعْرُوفٌ فَإِذَا عَزَمَ الأَمْرُ فَلَوْ صَدَقُوا اللَّهَ لَكَانَ خَيْرًا لَهُمْ –فَهَلْ عَسَيْتُمْ إِنْ تَوَلَّيْتُمْ أَنْ تُفْسِدُوا فِي الأَرْضِ وَتُقَطِّعُوا أَرْحَامَكُمْ

"Those who believe say: "If only a *Sūrah* (chapter) was sent down (for us)? But when a decisive *Sūrah* (explaining and ordering things) is sent down, and fighting (*Qitāl*) is mentioned (i.e. ordained) therein, you will see those in whose hearts is a disease (of hypocrisy) looking at you with a look of one fainting to death. But it was better for them (hypocrites, to listen to Allāh and to obey Him). Obedience (to Allāh) and good words (were better for them). And when the matter (preparation for *Jihād*) is resolved on, then if they had been true to Allāh, it would have been better for them."[7]

And now we will clarify to you the *Millah* of Ibrāhīm – peace be upon him – so that you can be upon clarity, and so that it will be apparent to you that it is the differentiation between the Truth and Falsehood – contrary to what some of them say, that *Islām* is a "modernistic" religion, so that they can mix the East with the West, and so that they can imitate them, and live amongst them.

---

[6] *Al-Hujurāt*: 15
[7] *Muhammad*: 21-22

3. Why I consider Imām Juhaymān ibn Sayf Al-'Utaybī رحمه الله as a Mujaddid

The reason I consider Imām Juhaymān رحمه الله as a Mujaddid is due to the reason that in my perspective I deem a Mujaddid (which means a person who renews) to be a person who has revived a great part of Islām or ways of it, which were practiced but later abandoned.

Unlike the deceived ones or the ones who prefer to be deceived due to any reason, I consider him thus as he revived a very important aspect of Islām, which is to fight the tawāghīt in their lands and liberate our lands from their hands.

As for the deceived ones, they prefer people like Ibn Bāz or Albānī or 'Uthayimīn to be their Mujaddidīn.

Now the reason I have not chosen them is: Ibn Bāz was a scholar of a tāghūt who died fighting in the path of the tāghūt – like it or dislike it - and he has but been a very handy tool in crushing each effort to bring Islām or the strivings of the Mujāhidīn against the apostate state of Saudī or the disbelievers in it. He has revived a methodology in which the oppressive, filthy tyrants who commit disbelief day and night without any shame and who commit all kinds of sins day and night to be the people upon the truth and who must be obeyed as they are "Walī Amrs", and people who are forgiven in this world and the hereafter due to their 'ignorance', while in the same methodology, the true sincere people who strive for the supremacy of Islām are labeled as corruptors, khawārij, and people who are to be punished in this world and the next due to them not obeying the Walī Khamrs (Islāmic leaders). A clear proof for this is his shameless verdict on killing Juhaymān رحمه الله and the four of the Muwa'hiddīn who killed American army men on the Saudī soil and his support for the capture of the Mujāhidīn and anyone who would go against the tāghūt Fahad.

And he permitted a timeless peace treaty with the Jews and allowed the wearing of the GCMG cross for Fahad, incited to fight the Mujāhidīn who fought against the tāghūt Fahad, and remained silent upon the prolonged staying of the Americans on Saudī from where they killed Millions of 'Irāqī Muslims.

In short, he was a traitor to the Ummah and a tool of the Zionist tāghūt Fahad which Fahad used very well as he made him an Imām to be loved and followed with the help of his media and other means – which will never deceive a true Muwa'hhid, as a tāghūt never favored a true Muwa'hhid the way Fahad favored Bin Bāz.

So he revived a Manhaj, in which scholars can help all the kufr and oppression of the tāghūt and yet can become Imām's or Mujaddidīn who can be taken as examples. And Ibn 'Uthayimīn runs after him in this.

As for Albānī, neither was he a Mu'haddīth as he doesn't have the conditions fulfilled to become one such as from not learning the amount of A'hādīth by heart (to be one), and due to him making many blunders which exceeds 1000 in his declaring a hadīth to be authentic. Above all this, he was the Mujaddid (reviver) of the creed of Ghulāt ul-Murji'ah in our time under the coat of Salaf; such a creed which its callers and debaters are declared as kāfirīn by Ibn Taimiyah رحمه الله and by Ahmed and Wakī رحمهم الله. The worst is his defending the tawāghīt basing upon that creed and his innovation of a Sūfī way to revive the religion by saying it is 'Tasfiyah and tarbiyah' (cleansing and moralizing).

So these people were Mujaddidīn of falsehood.

As for Juhaymān, he fought the falsehood, uprooted blind following, revived the lost correct Manhaj, fought against the tawāghīt and exposed the sell out scholars. So he was a one who revived the path of fighting the tawāghīt in an era in which this was almost abandoned and people were hiding and he has revived and inspired generations of the obligation of liberating the two sanctions from the hands of the apostates. Thus these are enough reasons for saying that he was a Mujaddid who taught the Ummah a lesson with his blood and with his death the coats of false piety which was taken off from sell outs like Bīn Bāz, and exposed their true colors of how they have sold their souls to the tāghūt.

So:

Nothing is known from any authentic source that Imām Juhaymān رحمه الله has said that his brother in law, Shaykh Muhammad bin 'Abdullāh رحمه الله was the Mahdī.

Only the tawāghīt and their speakers have spread this.

I have tried to get something authentic about this, and have even sat and studied under some Shuyūkh who were practically involved in this Noble Confrontation, but they never mentioned anything of that type that the two Great People (i.e., Juhaymān and 'Abdullāh) ever claimed that, so most likely it must be from the lies of āl-Salūl (may Allāh Humiliate them) to justify their slaughter of the 'As'hāb ul-Ukhdūd who stood up against the tyrant pharaoh.

It is better to focus on the more authentic points like:

1. The [military] strategy utilized by the noble army of Juhaymān رحمه الله was very effective. Thus they withheld the Kāfir army of āl-Salūl for more than a week, and the cowards were forced to bring in the Kāfir Army of France and use them to kill and slay the brothers.



French commandos Paul Barril (far left), Christian Lambert and Ignace Wodecki, accompanied by a Saudi officer, in the desert near Taef during the Mecca uprising.

The committee of the evil scholars - May Allāh humiliate them - again gave a fatwā here to kill Imām Juhaymān who stood against the tāghūt and asked the people to support the tāghūt.

2. The so-claimed fear which was in the hearts of the pilgrims. Due to this, it is nothing worth to be mentioned compared to the fear in which a true Mu'wahhid who loves Jihād and lives within the territory of āl-Salūl, especially when the scholars of the tāghūt are inciting people day and night to 'repent' from Islām (which is Jihād against tawāghīt and making takfīr of the tawāghīt) and inciting to report, spy and to help the tawāghīt in anyway they can to stop the jihād against the tawāghīt.

However, the killed people from pilgrims in this Jihād must be from either the apostate army of āl-Salūl or the kāfir French swine's, as people who stood to save the people from tawāghīt can in no way be thought that they would kill the pilgrims, but this must be blamed upon the brothers with the help of the sorcerers of pharaoh of āl-Salūl to justify their brutal acts towards these noble Mujāhidīn.

And now we see that even the Americans were involved, so let's wait till it is verified, then another slap for those who patch for the tawāghīt and their evil scholars.[8]

3. This effort of Juhaymān رحمه الله, which resulted in his Shahādah, was not forgotten in vain; thus blood spilled for such a noble cause has made lions alive from its fruits, and the forgotten way of fighting the apostates and expelling the tawāghīt from our lands were made alive.

May Allāh bless them all and enter them to paradise, and may Allāh destroy all who were involved in their killing, if they have not repented.


Detained members of Juhayman's group, hours after the clearing of the Qaboo underground.

[8] According to the book, "The Siege of Mecca" by Yaroslav Trofimov, he mentions that the Saudi Government asked the CIA for help in the Makkah siege. He writes on his website, "There were American citizens on both sides of the barricades. The gunmen occupying the Mosque included a number of African-American converts to Islam. Retired American military personnel were employed flying Saudi helicopters above the Mosque in support of the mission in Mecca. And the CIA provided tear gas and advice on the ground. At the end, however, it was the role of the French commandos that proved decisive in the final assault on the shrine." If the CIA incident was indeed true, then all we can say is: Wallahul Musta'ān!

4. Regarding the issue of fighting in the blessed Masjid al-Harām

A brother said:

Juhaymān رحمه الله did not even use to make takfīr of āl-Salūl when he made his attack; he might have changed his mind afterwards when he was in jail, Allāhu A'lam.

Also does Allāh not say:

وَاقْتُلُوهُمْ حَيْثُ ثَقِفْتُمُوهُمْ وَأَخْرِجُوهُم مِّنْ حَيْثُ أَخْرَجُوكُمْ وَالْفِتْنَةُ أَشَدُّ مِنَ الْقَتْلِ وَلاَ تُقَاتِلُوهُمْ عِندَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ حَتَّى يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ فِيهِ فَإِن قَاتَلُوكُمْ فَاقْتُلُوهُمْ كَذَلِكَ جَزَاء الْكَافِرِينَ

And slay them wherever ye catch them, and turn them out from where they have Turned you out; for tumult and oppression are worse than slaughter; but fight them not at the Sacred Mosque, unless they (first) fight you there; but if they fight you, slay them. Such is the reward of those who suppress faith. (Al-Baqarah: 191)

So initiating the fight in the Mosque in Makkah is forbidden unless the kuffār initiate it so if they initiate it then you can slay the murtadīn of Salūl but you cannot go there when no fighting is occurring within the sacred mosque and initiate a take over from there and Allāh knows best.

This āyah is what makes me see this siege as being wrong; not the fact that pilgrims were killed because as Sayyid said, "āl-Sālūl's dogs and the French commandos were probably behind that and Alhamdulillāh a lot of the pilgrims in the siege had supported Juhaymān رحمه الله wa ghafaralah.

His standing up to falsehood and a corrupt regime is not what I have an issue with but the thing I have a shubha (doubt) about is the method through which he aimed to do it رحمه الله.

If anyone disagrees with me please benefit us with your knowledge.

I said:

I fully agree with the methodology of Juhaymān رحمه الله in his striving to take the holiest place on earth from the hands of the apostates of āl-Salūl.

And verse which is quoted is not taken in its correct understanding, as the ka'bah doesn't give refuge to an apostate who must be killed.

And as brother Shaaze said, were the Americans to take siege of the Ka'bah and if they did not initiate a fight (physical), then are we to wait until they attack? No sane person would say this.

And as it is proven from the way of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, the fighting of apostates are given precedence over fighting the original disbelievers, so the āl-Salūl being apostates, they must be expelled and fought with a greater force than the kuffār asliyyah.

As 'Abdul Qādir فك الله أسره says, the tawāghīt who are upon our heads are 'Aduwwu as-Sāil (invading enemies) who are corrupting our religion and worldly affairs, so fighting them is from the most important obligation after īmān[9].

Therefore, wherever they are, especially when they are in control of the haramain, then they must be fought against and the above verse doesn't save their blood.

As Al-Qurtubī says in his tafsīr, "and ibn Khuweiz Mindād said: " ولا تقاتلوهم عند المسجد الحرام" is Mansūkh, because there is an Ijmā' that if an enemy takes control of Makkah and says 'I will fight you and stop you from Hajj and I will always be in Makkah', then it will be obligatory to fight him even if he doesn't start the fight…"

However, as for the above quote in which he states that it is Mansūkh, it is a weak stance as Ibn Kathīr and Shawkānī and others believed the verse is Muhkam, and refuted some proofs presented in the matter, and also Al-Qurtubī brought two aspects in which he presents that the verse is not made mansūkh.

I am presenting these words from the scholars just to present the point of views that they differed upon.

This verse is clear that we have to fight those who fight us in the Masjid al-Harām, thus if its protectors becomes apostates, then it is upon the whole Ummah to save it from their hands with whatever is necessary; if they fight (which they have already done) we will have to fight them. The case of the invading enemy is included in the part **"until they fight you in it."**

So this is in circumstances, and as for the one who helps the Mushrikīn of UN and nullifies parts of Sharī'ah like the foreign policies and that of trade, and takes control of the Haramain, gets himself protected with weapons, he must be fought with Aulawiyyah (with greater preference).

[9] To read more about this opinion from Shaykh 'Abdul Qādir ibn 'Abdil 'Azīz regarding the Apostasy of the Current day Rulers of the Muslim lands, please refer to his work entitled, "*Fundamental Concepts regarding al-Jihād*" under the chapter, "Section 15: And If the Sultān Disbelieves and Resists, Then It Is Obligatory to Fight Him; *Fardh 'Ayn*. And it is Prioritized Ahead of Other Than It."

And in reality there is no clear proof that Juhaymān رحمه الله started the fighting; if his entering with weapons are to be wronged, then āl-Salūl are more wrong as they, while being apostates, are in control of the place with weapons.

So how are we to take back the haramain if the enemies of Islām are controlling the place with weapons, without fighting them?

So the reason why the action is correct is, if you take control of the harām to protect it from the tawāghīt invading apostate enemies, and if they fight you to take it back, then you will have to fight back, and this is the case of Juhaymān رحمه الله, as it is apparent from what is heard.

Regarding the statement of Allāh,

يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الشَّهْرِ الْحَرَامِ قِتَالٍ فِيهِ قُلْ قِتَالٌ فِيهِ كَبِيرٌ وَصَدٌّ عَنْ سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَكُفْرٌ بِهِ وَالْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ وَإِخْرَاجُ أَهْلِهِ مِنْهُ أَكْبَرُ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ وَالْفِتْنَةُ أَكْبَرُ مِنَ الْقَتْلِ وَلا يَزَالُونَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ حَتَّى يَرُدُّوكُمْ عَنْ دِينِكُمْ إِنِ اسْتَطَاعُوا وَمَنْ يَرْتَدِدْ مِنْكُمْ عَنْ دِينِهِ فَيَمُتْ وَهُوَ كَافِرٌ فَأُولَئِكَ حَبِطَتْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ فِي الدُّنْيَا وَالآخِرَةِ وَأُولَئِكَ أَصْحَابُ النَّارِ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ

They ask you concerning fighting in the Sacred Months. Say, "Fighting therein is a great (transgression) but a greater (transgression) with Allāh is to prevent mankind from following the Way of Allāh, to disbelieve in Him, to prevent access to Al-Masjid al-Harām (at Makkah), and to drive out its inhabitants, and Al-Fitnah is worse than killing (2:217)

So we say: They ask you about putting a siege on Masjid al-Harām while declaring one of them to be the Mahdī (in which one can be mistaken due to the characteristics almost being complete in him) and while defending it from apostates; so even if we are to say that fighting there is a big sin and claiming one to be a Mahdī is a [major] mistake, it must be understood correctly that the greater sin is to support the apostates, to kill the Mujāhidīn, to ally with the apostate leaders, to eat the wealth of the Ummah in falsehood, to declare the Apostate Tawāghīt to be Islāmic leaders, to suppress each striving to prevent the Ummah from establishing the Ummah and helping it, to let the filthy Americans and French troops inside the Harām to fight the so-called rebels, to kill the ikhwān, to supporting Israel, and to worship the UN; undoubtedly, all of these are a much greater sin in front of Allāh.[10]

[10] The point here is not to say that the sins of āl-Salūl are greater than the "sins" of Imām Juhaymān, therefore we should pretend that he never made a mistake. If the Imām made a mistake in claiming his brother in law to be the Mahdī, then of course it was a mistake, but we don't go to the extent of calling it Kufr or a type of nullification of Islām as the filthy Apostates of āl-Salūl wish for us to believe. The point that is being made here is that, "even if Juhaymān did something evil, at least it is not an evil which has taken him outside the fold of Islām or a

5. In defense of Juhaymān رحمه الله and the words of those who declared him to be a man of falsehood from various angles

---

type of evil which obligates the Muslims to fight against him unlike the evils of āl-Salūl. One should never overlook the fact that āl-Salūl has committed all of these aforementioned crimes (and more) – not to mention the fact that the Saudi establishment came into power after rebelling the Ottoman Khilāfah for a monthly salary from the British – and then look at Juhaymān as if he committed something even greater. It is not fair from any way one looks at it.

Here we would like to refute some of the misconceptions and false arguments brought forth against Imām Juhaymān رحمه الله.[11]

---

[11] To understand the background of some of these claims, here is a helpful comment which Br. Inshāllāhshahīd left which helped in further developing a response to those who reject the teachings of Juhaymān:

> Assalam Alaikum,
>
> Someone passed on a video of a Khutbah that Juhaymaan gave in Masjid al-Harām during the siege.
>
> http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=6633923801703714256&q=%D8%AC%D9%87%D9%8A%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%86&hl=en
>
> This is what the person said about the video:
>
> *"Here is a video that shows Juhayman's speech at the haram and telling people to give bay'ah to his brother in law (the first part.. the rest is just an interview with some relatives of theirs and people who were there, and Juhayman and his men) the first part is what is important, his speech.*
>
> *20 minutes and a half through the video (20:30)*
> *He said in his khutba: the man you are going to do bay'ah to today is Muhammad bin Abdullah, and he is from Quraysh, his father is from al-Ashraf (from ahl al-bayt) and his mother is from al-Ashraf*
> *then he mentions what he thinks are proofs for him being the mahdi*
>
> *And he mentions hadiths about the mahdi starting from about 10 minutes through the video, in the begining of the khutba then he orders some of his men to close the haram's doors, then he continues his khutba about the mahdi then he declares his sister's husband to be the mahdi whom the people will make bay'ah to. …."*
>
> Tell me what you think about this akhee.
>
> Jazakullah Khair

I (Sayyid) responded as follows:

> Assalāmu Alaykum
>
> Brother Inshallāhshaheed,
>
> First of all the quality of the sound is very weak and I can hardly distinguish what the alleged voice of Juhaymān رحمه الله is saying,
>
> Secondly, a recorded voice is nothing upon which we can judge a person as it is not a proof.

One brother wrote,

> *Assalam alaikum,*
>
> *They say "For him to officially call and declare someone the Mahdi who wasn't is something very serious."*

This is an argument I have seen by some naïve people, saying that the claiming of Juhaymān رحمه الله (if it is proven) that his brother in law is Mahdī is as if it is a very great error with which one's credibility is lost, and a matter upon his teachings must be rejected and he must be believed as someone who died upon a false creed.

But in reality it is again from the misguiding techniques of the scholars of the Tāghūt who have yet not recovered (and never they will Inshā'Allāh) from the exposure they faced from their falseness being completely exposed by this great Mujaddid. As it is not but merely falsely believing in a matter which was prophesized when the characteristics of that prophecy was almost found, so this cannot be judged as a grave mistake, rather a light one in which a person cannot be criticized.

Thirdly, it is prepared by the Apostates against the Muwa'hhidīn, so we must be alert for distortions and coercion of the ones interviewed.

Fourthly, at the time of the siege, as you can see in the book you recommended (The Siege of Mecca) - a copy of it I obtain - that the Salūlī govt. closed all media and closed all the airports and borders thus blocking all the news and what was happening there; so a report which is prepared by the enemy is the last thing we should be taking as a proof. As you are aware of the cunningness of the āl-Salūl in deception since their beginning as how they portrayed the Ikhwān as Khawārij and got them martyred by others, so there would be a great possibility of them having coming with the strategy in which all the Muslims will hate them and not think of helping them.

So I shall believe it if four Muslims who are just and not sell-outs testify that he said that.

But if it is even a possibility, then I shall answer to it and explain Inshā'Allāh why it is not as people portray it and why I still deem him to be a Mujaddid while placing him where he belongs and while still showing how it is very correct to do what he did.

Assalāmu Alaikum

An example of this is some of the Sa'hābah رضي الله عنهم believed that Ibn Sayyād was the Dajjāl, as there were signs in him which might confuse a person in believing that he was actually the Dajjāl, which he was not, and the proofs are many. So none came and criticized the Sa'hābah رضي الله عنهم for believing that or said that they are upon a great misguidance.[12]

The reason I made the misunderstanding of the Sa'hābah رضي الله عنهم to thinking Ibn Sayyād as Dajjāl to this is that they also did make barā'ah (disavowal) from him and most of the Muslims after the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم stayed away from him based on this creed while he was a Muslim. So these are also wrong rulings based on that judgment. Now when one declares a person to be a Mahdī, there is no blind obedience to him, but rather the general rule of "there is no obedience to the creation in the disobedience of the Creator" is still intact, as there is no saying that the Mahdī must be obeyed blindly. But rather he is a guided person who will bring justice to the earth. So this must not be mixed, as in many minds it is made the same as one claiming another to be a prophet, while the matter is not like that. So Juhaymān's claiming another to be a Mahdī is not a matter upon which he can be rejected as a misguided person, but rather this is from the magic of the Magicians of the new tawāghīt who make such a big matter of it to justify their misguidance. His claiming at most can be said that he by mistake has thought so-and-so to be the Mahdī, and he made a wrong Ijtihād upon which he would be rewarded. The Sa'hābah thought that 'Umar رضي الله عنه is the one "who would stand up to Dajjāl and face him and would be made the best of the Martyrs" and they were certain it would be him till he passed away. But by them thinking this didn't make them misguided ones, but rather it is their wrong Ijtihād upon which they would be rewarded. The reason I am again making these equal is that all of these are prophesies in which one can do a mistake, and this is not in any way connected to the roots of our 'Aqīdah. As for the Mahdī, there is no indication that he would have special powers; rather he would be a just leader whom Allāh will make people know by a sign, and whose is from Qureish and whose father's name would be that of the Prophet's صلى الله عليه وسلم fathers name. So it is very likely that a person maybe mistaken as Muhammad bin Abdullāh was of very good behavior and he from being of Qureish and the similarity in name. So once again the analogy is correct. And Allāh knows best.

And like the thinking of many, the Sultān Al-Fāti'h who was said to have legislated or allowed to legislate man-made laws in the Ottoman Sultanate, was the one who from this Ummah has liberated Constantinople (from Shirk), which is incorrect as such a person cannot be termed a Muslim.

Even the recent claims that the Tālibān are the ones mentioned in the Hadīth who would come with black turbans or black flags, which can be correct, but

[12] To read these Ahadīth, please go here: http://www.islamworld.net/hour/Six.txt

we cannot be sure of; so if we were proven wrong then many of those who claimed this must be in great misguidance?

And there are some cases that the salaf thought that such-and-such was what was prophesized in the Hadīth while they were incorrect; so for that, none claimed them to be upon great misguidance. And the first example is enough to explain the unjustness of the people who say that Juhaymān رحمه الله, due to him claiming his brother in law to be the Mahdī (who had the characteristics of Mahdī almost complete in him), was in great misguidance. But the matter is not really their wanting to explain the truth for the people, but rather they have a very effective technique which they borrowed from the kuffār of Qureish in stopping people from hearing the truth, and that showing slight mistakes as mountains so that people may hate and despise the person with truth and stay away and not hear from them. And sometimes they make lies and spread it so people may not even get near thus they may be guided. And this technique can been seen very effectively used by the Mushrikīn in the time of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. Even when one looks in to the history of this adulterous state of Salūl, they see how they termed the best of Muwa'hhidīn to be khawārij so that the people would hate them and attack them (a name which still parrots from Salūl in ignorance). Imām Juhaymān رحمه الله said:

> "*Then when his ('Abdul 'Azīz – may Allāh curse him) kingdom was established and goal achieved, he then allied himself with the Christians. And he stopped the continuation of the Jihād in the path of Allāh outside of Jazīrah (Arab Lands). Thus when they (Ikhwān) went out to fight the Mushrikīn of 'Irāq who called 'Alī and Fātimah and Al-Hasan and Al-Hussein with Allāh (in Shirk), they named them –him ['Abdul Azīz] and the Shuyūkh of ignorance with him - with a name which the people of Islām hates and it is Khawārij; while the Ikhwān did not rebel against him and they did not obey him when he forbade them from Jihād, and after he named them khawārij, he incited those who did not go out with them (Ikhwān) to fight them.*"

Hence after deeply thinking, it is clear that the puppet scholars of the tāghūt have amplified the matter as to make the people hate him so much that he is portrayed as a traitor, a Dajjāl, a devious kāfir and corruptor. Thus they did this so none would even want to hear the arguments of Juhaymān رحمه الله. And it is similar to the attempted character assassination of the likes of Sayyid Qutb رحمه الله by the likes of Rabī'u and other rented donkeys of the Salūlī Government.

As for Muhammad bin 'Abdullāh رحمه الله, it is said by those who know him that he was one of the best students and who would be at the first row to forbid munkar (evil) and order good, and he was of very good behavior. So if they made a mistake in thinking Muhammad bin 'Abdullāh to be a Mahdī, then it is not at all a grave misguidance upon which we should reject what they brought

from truth but rather it is an Ijtihād upon which he would be rewarded. And I shall Inshā'Allāh further emphasize upon this point later as to why it is a rewarded Ijtihād other than a great misguidance.

Some have said,

> *"If he could have done what he did for the reason that the rulers were murtadūn, then to me it is less grievous compared to his fighting them based on their being corrupt and secondly because he thinks the Mahdī has appeared."*

The real and latter opinion of Juhaymān regarding the Salūlī govt. remains hidden and was not known to us (there is a possibility that most of his works were erased from the face of the earth and that any indication about the apostasy of the Salūlī govt. was erased with it), but his works really have indications that the Salūlī govt. is a kāfir Government as he has said, *"he then allied himself with the Christians. And he stopped the continuation of the Jihād in the path of Allāh outside of Jazīrah (Arab Lands)."* And it is not hidden from the likes of Juhaymān that he made takfīr of those who allied themselves with the kuffār. But there is no indication proving that he fought based on the fact that Muhāmmad bin 'Abdullāh is the Mahdī (if what brother Inshāllāhshahīd brought is true); it seems rather that it is what was in the process and not due to "he is the Mahdī we have to fight with him." This can be confirmed from the point that he made it clear to keep their Manhaj clear and not based on deception and secrecy and lies as he states in Raf'ul Iltibās:

> ***And the last group**: it walks different from the guidance of the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم, and walks the path of making thoughts as judges, from its fundamentals is hiding under different veils, [and] they try to betray those who work under their authority.*
>
> *And he صلى الله عليه وسلم said in Sahīh Muslim: "there is no betrayal in Islām."*
>
> *And he says in the Hadīth of Alī رضي الله عنه in Al-Bukhārī in the expedition of Kheibar: "call them to Islām."*

So as to think best of the believers, I am sure that if he based upon this (that his brother in law is the Mahdī) he would have made it clear earlier.

But the astonishing matter is that one cannot say "less grievous" as fighting them is praiseworthy, rather wājib upon the Ummah, as they are considered as invading enemies due them being apostates and being forceful custodians of the holiest places on the earth.

So this is placing things in its correct place, as a person who had revived the following of proofs and rejecting of the wide spread scholar worshipping. He revived the methodology of fighting the apostates, revived the true nature of Walā (alliance) and Barā'ah (disavowal), paved the path to make the Ummah wake up as to understand that the most sacred two places of us belongs to apostates so we need to fight them to take it back, and revived the pure Taw'hīd. So such a person is called a Mujaddid, due to him reviving these great fundamentals. And this is keeping things in its correct place.

Some say,

> *"And tell me if you were in the shoes of the government scholars and you were to give a verdict over a person that calls the Ummah to give baiy'ah to a false mahdī what will you do? Hence I don't see the fatwa leading to his execution as wrong. Rather that was the best thing to be done at that time. And the government scholars were right at that - although they hide a lot from the Ummah."*

Allāhul Musta'ān! What heavy words are these! The root of this mistake is that instead of realizing that Allāh has commanded us to follow our religion to judge any matter, the people judge others based upon something else. So based upon this misguidance, many people have let apostates to be those of this Ummah. They have judged them with their understanding while leaving our religion out, hence excusing them in clear kufr. For example, they say that "if a person helps a kāfir leader knowing that he is a kāfir, then such a person is an apostate, but if he fights in the path of a kāfir (a tāghūt like Fahad) thinking him to be a Muslim, then such a person is an oppressor and fāsiq."

The above mistake is due to one not differentiating between the type of kufr and its reasons, as the type of kufr is his helping a kāfir against a Muslim, while the reason is his ignorance or false ta'wīl (interpretation), so his action is in itself a kufr, and he is judged as a kāfir after the Hujjah (evidence) has been established upon the one who is ignorant and under the power of the Muslims. But no one can say that he is a Muslim as he has done clear kufr. This is a very common mistake from the people when they enter into the matter of takfīr as takfīr is only made upon its types as it is what becomes apparent through words or actions, and takfīr has no connection to the reasons which are related to the heart; Islām runs upon the apparent and we are not commanded to cut open the hearts.

So it is from clear falsehood to say, "If I was in his shoes…" as the matter is clear kufr since they have given a verdict helping the apostates to kill the Muwa'hhidīn. Rather thinking ourselves to be in their shoes, which is to judge them with *their form of religion*, we have to judge them with *our religion*, and our religion tells us that they have - in the time when they differed with the Muwa'hhidīn in a Far'ī (non fundamental) or matters of tactics - allied

themselves with the apostates and helped them against the Muwa'hhidīn by issuing a verdict to get them killed, which is great in front of Allāh, as they have allowed the blood of Muslims to be spilt for the sake of a tāghūt. What would the religion come to if we were to say that 'if you were in the shoes of Bush, then even you would invade Afghānistān…' So I ask: if you were in their shoes (scholars of the tāghūt) then does your action (helping apostates against Muslims) not become clear kufr?

So you're seeing the verdict as permissible, where in reality it is being pleased with the killing of the best of Muwa'hhidīn for the sake of an apostate. So see the misguidance you have fallen into by judging the religion whilst 'being in their shoes.' Furthermore, you have transgressed by saying that it is the best that could have been done! So now the best what could have been done is to kill believers who if mistaken in the matter of the Mahdī, were mistaken in a non-fundamental matter, while the apostates have clearly done major kufr, which is related to the fundamentals. So how can you say that it is the best thing?! Rather it is of the worst blunders and greatest sins that they (Scholars) helped the apostates against the Muwa'hhidīn.

Again I remind, the mistake of Juhaymān رحمه الله in thinking his brother in law to be Mahdī (if proven) is a wrong Ijtihād upon which we hope that he would be rewarded, and the matter is not related to the roots of the religion; it is not as thinking this is another Prophet, rather the Mahdī as mentioned above is a just ruler who will have characteristics which were very similar to those of his brother in law. So how does this matter make his blood Halāl? How can one say that this is a great misguidance? What is the aspect of this misguidance? Is this greater or thinking an Apostate tāghūt to be a Muslim? So we must not make the non-fundamental matters appear to be fundamental matters when they are not.

Therefore I ask: what were the scholars of the tāghūt correct in? By helping the apostates all their lives? By killing the best of the Muwa'hhidīn who strove to liberate the Haramein from the hands of apostates? Their silence when the French were allowed to enter Harām to kill the Muwa'hhidīn? Or their making a non-fundamental matter to appear as if it is fundamental to justify their brutal killings? So which of it is the 'best'?! I ask you! Upon what basis can the killing be 'best'? Is it their striving to liberate the Harām from the hands of apostates or their claiming someone to be Mahdī? Well if one claims to be Mahdī, does the Sharī'ah allow us to kill that person while utilizing the kuffār? No it does not as it is not kufr. So one can argue the matter to the extent that no one can make them understand; I say: it is agreed, and if they tell me why, they say, 'they have weapons,' so I say agreed, then I ask, 'so this also must mean that we do not need to establish the Hujjah before making takfīr of the scholars of the tāghūt,' as they are under the protection of an apostate regime who has weapons to be used against Islām and due to them not being in a position where we can make them understand? Answer us if you are truthful!

I want to note here the lies of āl-Salūl and its parrots saying that Juhaymān رحمه الله killed the pilgrims. I reject this because I think best of the believers and worst from apostates. To think best from the believers is that, they would never kill an unlawful blood, so I want to remind you of the possibilities:

1. The death of the pilgrims could be due to the attacks and bombings which āl-Salūl later lied about and said that Juhaymān did it so they can justify their brutality.

2. The death of the pilgrims could be due to that one or many pilgrims wanted to help āl-Salūl (as their cronies would be many), so in such a time, even a pilgrim can be killed if he wanted to help the apostates against the believers as it allows the blood.

3. But in no way can we think that Juhaymān رحمه الله did it, as how can those who strive for Allāh even do this?

This is similar to the accusations that the Mujāhidōn are killing Muslims with their bombs intentionally; how can those who are striving to save the Muslims, kill the Muslims? And as the current media wants them to be portrayed like that, it is certain that āl-Salūl would lie to justify their crimes of killing the pilgrims and frame Juhaymān رحمه الله.

In conclusion, he is at most a person who did a wrong Ijtihād in a non-fundamental matter which is not related to the roots of our creed and which is not kufr (i.e., claiming another to be the Mahdī). But as he has revived many things of the religion, he is our beloved Mujaddid, Imām and Mujāhid, Juhaymān bin Sayf Al 'Utaybī رحمه الله.

All praises be to Allāh.